

**Council on Educational Services for Exceptional Children  
Meeting Minutes  
December 16, 2009**

Members Present

Bob	Atwater	
Sonja	Brown	
Odell	Clanton	
Susan	Humbert	
Nicole	Jimerson	
Cathy	Kea	
Felix	Keyes	
Sheila	Knapp	
Shary	Maskel	
Ann	Maxwell	
Doris	McCain	
Teresa	Mebane	
Dwight	Pearson	
Bernette	Kelley	for Lisa Phillips
Kathy	Blankenship	for Joe Sutton
Curt	Garland	for Gloria Upperman
Mark	Yost	

Members Absent

Jana	Griggs
Esther	High
Sally	Hunter
Linda	Nelson
Jill	Scercy
Laura	Wiley
Cynthia	Wilson

Visitors

Cynthia	Daniels-Hall
Eric	Hall
Brenda	Monforti
Lynn	Rogers

DPI Staff / Presenters

Tish	Bynum
Nancy	Johnson
Kate	Neale
Mary	Watson
Ira	Wolfe

**Welcome / Review of Agenda / Approval of Minutes**

Sonja Brown, Chairperson, opened the meeting with introductions of members and guests. Chairperson Brown recommended the Council take a few minutes to review today's agenda.

The September meeting minutes were approved without any edits.

**State Performance Plan**

Nancy Johnson, Consultant with the Exceptional Children Division, presented to the Council a draft of NC's State Performance Plan (SPP) with the most current data and review proposed revisions. Additionally, the Council was asked to provide input on setting targets for several Indicators within the SPP. The reason the SPP indicates "draft" is that data comes from varying sources and NC must verify that the data is accurate.

The SPP provided to the Council lists all 20 Indicators, the current rate based on 2008-2009 data, progress from the 2007-2008 data, met/not target and any applicable proposed target changes. Some of the proposed changes are based on a change in federal requirements. Not all Indicators will be discussed in detail.

Indicator 1 – Graduation – The four-year rate did increase by .5%; but NC did not meet the target of 60%. The US Dept. of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is now highly recommending a target of 80% for the four-year graduation rate.

The five-year graduation rate increased 8.2% which is very significant. It indicates that one extra year for students with disabilities makes a tremendous difference. By way of the meeting minutes, the Council wants to officially state that it recommends including the five-year graduation rate in the SPP.

Indicator 1 requires the Council's input. The proposed revisions are largely based on OSEP's "highly recommended" suggestions, which will eventually become the target set by OSEP. The proposed revisions also incorporate the use of four major Division initiatives; Responsiveness to Instruction, Positive Behavior Support and the State Improvement Project for Reading and Math. The Council voted to accept the proposed revisions.

Indicator 2 – Drop out – The rate and progress are yet to be determined. The current target is 6%; last year's target was 8%. OSEP has strongly recommended that NC use the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). However, the data source for the CSPR report is different and a year behind. Meaning, NC would be reporting based on 2007-2008 data instead of 2008-2009 data.

Indicator 3A – Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) – This Indicator reflects how many LEAs made AYP. NC increased from 48.9% to 60.9% and surpassed the target of 45%.

Indicator 3B – Participation/Math and Reading and Indicator 3C – Proficiency/Math and Reading – These Indicators relate to the participation rates of students with disabilities in statewide assessments, grades 3-8 and 10. NC met the targets for grades 3-8. However, Grade 10 rates decreased due to OSEP determining that Extend2 and OCS was not a substantial enough mirror to the general curriculum content standards and these students were disallowed in the participation rates.

Indicator 3 requires the Council's input. The proposed revisions are largely based on OSEP's "highly recommended" suggestions, which will eventually become the target set by OSEP. The proposed revisions also incorporate the use of four major Division initiatives; Responsiveness to Instruction, Positive Behavior Support and the State Improvement Project for Reading and Math. The Council voted to accept the proposed revisions.

Indicator 4A – Suspensions/Expulsions (>10 days) – NC reported 2.3% with a decrease of 2.9%. Five districts' data produced this effective because they had greater than twice the state average.

Indicator 4B – Suspensions/Expulsions by Race and Ethnicity – This is a new Indicator and the first report on this Indicator is 2/1/2012.

Indicator 5A and 5B – LRE – NC met the target

Indicator 5C – NC did decrease this target, but, did not meet the target. This includes special schools, homebound, residential placements, etc.

Indicator 6 – LRE/Preschool – This is a new Indicator and reporting is not required until 2/1/2012.

Indicator 7 – Preschool Outcomes – This Indicator needs the Council's input to determine baseline data and targets. There are two suggestions in setting baseline data. NC can report

based on raw data or use data based on a two-year average with a 2010-2011 target increased by .1%. The Council should be careful not to set the targets too high. NC's current raw data rate is pretty high. This is a new Indicator and NC will know more once trend data can be analyzed. The Council decided to use the two-year average data option as targets.

Indicator 8 – Parent Involvement – Parents are surveyed during the year based on statewide representation. Based on the 25-questions survey, NC did increase on rate for parent involvement, but missed the target by 1%.

Indicator 9 and 10 – Disproportionality – First it must be determined if the LEA had disproportionate representation based upon inappropriate identification. If so, then the LEA must have a 3.0 risk ratio of children of a specific race being three times more likely than all other children to be identified in special education. This is the benchmark for disproportionality.

In some districts, Severely Emotional Disabled (SED) appears to be a category in which African American students appear to be more likely identified than their peers. Also, another issue could be, ratios not matching school population demographics could be considered as disproportionality. This Indicator causes LEAs to really examine their data to discover sources of disproportionality.

Indicator 11 and 12 – 90 Day Timeline and Transition Part C to Part B – NC continues to make annual progress but did not meet the targets.

Indicator 13 – Secondary Transition and Indicator 14 – Post School Outcomes – are considered new Indicators because of the data collection process, requirements and measurements were changed by the federal government. The first reporting on these Indicators is due 2/1/2012.

Indicator 15 – Correction of Noncompliance – This Indicator reports on districts that correct noncompliance issues within the one year timeline. Verified data for this Indicator was not available for this meeting.

Indicator 16 – Timely Complaints and Indicator 17 – Timely Due Process Hearing – These are compliance Indicators. Targets are set at 100% by the federal government. NC met both of these targets.

Indicator 18 – Resolution Meetings – NC reported an increase of 15.8% to 71.4%, but, did not meet the target of 75%-85%. It should be noted that the national average for this Indicator is 55%, so NC is doing very well with resolution meetings.

Indicator 19 – Mediations – NC reported an increase of 12% to 80% and met the target of 75%-85%.

Indicator 20 – Timely and Accurate Data – This applies to all submissions to federal government. NC met the target of 100%.

## **Amendments to Policies**

The public comment hearing on revisions to the Policies is tonight at DPI from 5:30 pm – 7:00 pm. The revisions originated from OSEP's regulation changes in December 2008. OSEP's revision included the parental right to revoke consent of services.

Some revisions to the Policies are for clarification purposes only. An example is adding a list of common diagnoses under the category of Autism.

A significant change is the SLD analysis. The analysis is based on three parts – inadequate achievement, insufficient progress, or a pattern of strengths or weakness. NC now uses the same analysis, whether using the discrepancy model or RtI model.

The Policies will ultimately go to the State Board of Education after the public comment period. Comments may also be submitted via the EC Division website.

### **Announcements/Recognitions / Comments/Questions from morning presentations**

Odell Clanton, EC Director in Warren County, was presented with a certificate of achievement for his dutiful years of service to the Council and exceptional children within the state. Mr. Clanton is retiring December 31, 2009.

### **Agency Update**

DPI is working hard with Race to the Top. Race to the Top funds will require alignment with the national standards that have yet to be released. It is uncertain the effect accepting the national standards will have on NC's efforts with revising its own content standards.

The 59<sup>th</sup> Conference on Exceptional Children was a huge success. Our focus this year was "growing our own and harvesting results." Instead of national presenters for training, we brought in "homegrown" presenters. For the past eight years, the Division has focused on building capacity within the LEAs so assistance doesn't always have to come directly from the state. This also results in more positive results for our students.

Continuing growth is occurring in schools implementing Positive Behavior Support. For these schools, the data is overwhelmingly positive in attendance, increased academic scores and lower rates of suspensions. Model schools implementing PBS may be visited by other schools.

NC SIP training in reading and math to teachers directly relates to students' results as evidenced by NC SIP data.

School participation in RtI is increasing. Again, the data is overwhelmingly positive for students with disabilities.

OCS Essential Standards are being revised due to a federal mandate because the federal government stated OCS does not align with the rigor of the standard course of study.

A Title II audit finding resulted in a finding that teachers who are teaching core content subjects must be licensed in that core content area. Use of PRAXIS 0511 is not acceptable for establishing highly-qualified status for middle and high school "teacher of record."

DPI and DHHS are collaboratively working to provide regional services for hearing and/or visually impaired students.

NC has model literacy sites for Deaf-Blind.

Meeting adjourned.